

Remarks

In response to Examiner's Notice dated January 4, 2008, Applicant has provided herewith a complete listing of the claims. Applicant reaffirms the election of Subspecies I (Figure 1A), with identification of corresponding claims 1-39 and 43, and with traverse. Applicant submits that each of these claims is readable on Figure 1A. For example, each of these claims contains similar aspects directed to a multi-region body which includes a first region dominated by a first polarization that extends to a first junction, a second region dominated by an opposite polarization that extends to a second junction, and an intermediate region having a length extending from the first junction to the second junction. In addition, each of these claims further contains aspects directed to a gate coupled to the body and adapted for using a control signal, when the body is reversed biased, to modulate the length of the intermediate region by changing a concentration of carriers in the intermediate region. Applicant notes that, while various claims contain additional features that are represented in other Figures, each of claims 1-39 and 43 are readable on Figure 1A since the additional features recited in those claims are not precluded by what is shown and described with respect to Figure 1A. For claimed features to read on different species, the different species must mutually exclude the features. Moreover, Applicant's specification explains that Figure 1A is used to represent various embodiments; see *e.g.*, page 12:7-20; page 13:4-10, page 13:11-21 and page 13:22-page 16:11. Thus, simply because a claim may read on one Figure does not preclude that claim from reading on additional Figures and multiple embodiments. Accordingly, pursuant to PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2, claims 1-39 and 43 relate to a single general inventive concept, because each of claims 1-39 and 43 contain the above mentioned corresponding special technical features.

Applicant maintains his traversal of the secondary/subspecies restrictions for insufficient bases. For example, the Office Action presents the conclusion that the subject claims lack unity of invention because "they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1." However, the PCT search was conducted on each of these subject claims in accordance with this same PCT Rule thereby evidencing that these

claims are linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. Moreover, in response to the PCT search, the Written Opinion expressly states that the claimed invention is both novel and constituting an inventive step over the prior art. The Written Opinion further includes a clear explanation under Section V that the claims are considered as such in a manner that would appear to be considered, under the PCT Rule 13.1, a single general inventive concept.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the secondary/subspecies restrictions for examination of all the claims 1-39 and 43.

Respectfully submitted,
Crawford Maunu PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
St. Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633 x101

Date: January 30, 2008

By: 

Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No. 32,122